Planck-scale soccer-ball problem: a case of mistaken identity

Giovanni AMELINO-CAMELIA[1,2]

[1] *Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Roma "La Sapienza", P.le A. Moro 2, 00185 Roma, EU*
[2] *INFN, Sez. Roma1, P.le A. Moro 2, 00185 Roma, EU*

Over the last decade it has been found that nonlinear laws of composition of momenta are predicted by some alternative approaches to "real" 4D quantum gravity, and by all formulations of dimensionally-reduced (3D) quantum gravity coupled to matter. The possible relevance for rather different quantum-gravity models has motivated several studies, but this interest is being tempered by concerns that a nonlinear law of addition of momenta might inevitably produce a pathological description of the total momentum of a macroscopic body. I here show that such concerns are unjustified, finding that they are rooted in failure to appreciate the differences between two roles for laws composition of momentum in physics. Previous results relied exclusively on the role of a law of momentum composition in the description of spacetime locality. However, the notion of total momentum of a multi-particle system is not a manifestation of locality, but rather reflects translational invariance. By working within an illustrative example of quantum spacetime I show explicitly that spacetime locality is indeed reflected in a nonlinear law of composition of momenta, but translational invariance still results in an undeformed linear law of addition of momenta building up the total momentum of a multi-particle system.

arXiv:1407.7891v1 [gr-qc] 29 Jul 2014

I. INTRODUCTION

An emerging characteristic of quantum-gravity research over the last decade has been a gradual shift of focus toward manifestations of the Planck scale on momentum space, particularly pronounced in some approaches to quantum gravity. For some research lines based on spacetime noncommutativity several momentum-space structures have been in focus, including the possibility of deformed laws of composition of momenta, which shall be here of interest. While deformed laws of composition of momenta are found to be inevitable in some approaches based on spacetime noncommutativity (see, *e.g.*, Refs. [1–6]), the situation is less certain in the loop-quantum-gravity approach. For "real" 4D loop quantum gravity the relevant issues are partly obscured by our present limited understanding of the semiclassical limit of that theory [7], but some indirect arguments suggest that a nonlinear law of composition of momenta might arise [8]. And these arguments find further strength in results on 3D loop quantum gravity, where the simplifications afforded by that dimensionally-reduced model allow one to rigorously show that indeed the nonlinearities on momentum space are present (see, *e.g.*, Ref. [9]). Actually, evidence is growing that in all alternative formulations of 3D quantum gravity coupled to matter there are nonlinearities in momentum space, including nonlinear laws of composition of momenta (see, *e.g.*, Ref. [10]). Also noteworthy is the role played by nonlinearities on momentum space in two recently-proposed approaches to the quantum-gravity problem: the one based on group field theory [11] and the one based on the relative-locality framework [12].

Due to the lack of experimental guidance a variety of approaches to quantum gravity are being developed, and in most cases the different approaches have very little in common. This of course endows with additional reasons of interest any result which is found to apply to more than one approach. Indeed, there has been growing interest in the conceptual implications and possible phenomenological implications [13] of nonlinear laws on momentum space and particularly nonlinear laws of composition of momenta. However, this interest is being tempered by concerns that a nonlinear law of addition of momenta might inevitably produce a pathological description of the total momentum of a macroscopic body [14–22] (also see Refs. [23–25], for a related discussion focused within the novel relative-locality framework). This issue has been often labelled as the "soccer-ball problem" [16]: the quantum-gravity pictures lead one to expect nonlinearities of the law of composition of momenta which are suppressed by the Planck scale ($\sim 10^{28} eV$) and would be unobservably small for particles at energies we presently can access, but in the analysis of a macroscopic body, such as a soccer ball, one might have to add up very many of such minute nonlinearities, ultimately obtaining results in conflict with observations [14–22].

If this so-called "soccer-ball problem" really was a scientific problem (a case of actual conflict with experimental data) we could draw rather sharp conclusions about several areas of quantum-gravity research. Perhaps most notably we should consider as ruled out large branches of research on quantum-gravity based on spacetime noncommutativity and we should consider the whole effort of research on dimensionally-reduced 3D quantum gravity as completely unreliable in forming an intuition for "real" 4D quantum gravity. However, I here show that previous discussions of this soccer-ball problem [14–25] failed to appreciate the differences between two roles for laws of composition of momentum in physics. Previous results supporting a nonlinear law of addition of momenta relied exclusively on the role of a law of momentum composition in the description of spacetime locality. The notion of total momentum of a multi-particle system is not a manifestation of locality, but rather reflects translational invariance in interacting theories. After being myself con-

fused about these issues for quite some time [16] I feel I am now in position to articulate the needed discussion at a completely general level. However, considering the tone and content of the bulk of literature that precedes this contribution of mine I find it is best to opt here instead for a very explicit discussion, based on illustrative examples of calculations performed within a specific simple model affected by nonlinearities for a law of composition of momenta. The model I focus on has 2+1-dimensional pure-spatial κ-Minkowski noncommutativity [1–6], with the time coordinate left unaffected by the deformation and the two spatial coordinates, x_1 and x_2, governed by

$$[x_1, x_2] = i\ell x_1 \tag{1}$$

(with the deformation scale ℓ expected to be of the order of the inverse of the Planck scale).

In the next section I briefly review within this example of quantum spacetime previous arguments showing that spacetime locality is reflected in a nonlinear law of composition of momenta. Then Section III takes off from known results on translational invariance for κ-Minkowski noncommutative spacetimes and builds on those to achieve the first ever example of translationally-invariant interacting two-particle system in κ-Minkowski. This allows me to verify explicitly that the conserved charge associated with that translational invariance (the total momentum of the two-particle system) adds linearly the momenta of the two particles involved. Section IV offers some closing remarks.

II. SOCCER-BALL PROBLEM AND SUM OF MOMENTA FROM LOCALITY

The ingredients needed for seeing a nonlinear law of composition of momenta emerging from noncommutativity of type (1) are very simple. Essentially one needs only to rely on results establishing that functions of coordinates governed by (1) still admit a rather standard Fourier expansion (see, *e.g.*, Ref. [1, 2])

$$\Phi(x) = \int d^4k \ \tilde{\Phi}(k) \ e^{ik_\mu x^\mu}$$

and that the notion of integration on such a noncommutative space preserves many of the standard properties including [1, 3]

$$\int d^4x \ e^{ik_\mu x^\mu} = (2\pi)^4 \delta^{(4)}(k) \, . \tag{2}$$

It is a rather standard exercise for practitioners of spacetime noncommutativity to use these tools in order to enforce locality within actions describing classical fields. For example, one might want to introduce in the action the product of three (possibly identical, but in general different) fields, Φ, Ψ, Υ, insisting on locality in the sense that the three fields be evaluated "at the same quantum point x", *i.e.* $\Phi(x)\,\Psi(x)\,\Upsilon(x)$. There is still no consensus on how one should formulate the more interesting quantum-field version of such theories, and it remains unclear to which extent and in which way our ordinary notion of locality is generalized by the requirement of evaluating "at the same quantum point x" fields intervening in a product such as $\Phi(x)\,\Psi(x)\,\Upsilon(x)$. Nonetheless for the classical-field case there is a sizable literature consistently adopting this prescription for locality. Important for my purposes here is the fact that, with such a prescription, locality inevitably leads to a nonlinear law of composition of momenta, as I show explicitly in the following example:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int d^4\hat{x} \ \Phi(\hat{x}) \ \Psi(\hat{x}) \ \Upsilon(\hat{x}) = \qquad (3)\\
&= \int d^4\hat{x} \int d^4k \int d^4p \int d^4q \, \tilde{\Phi}(k) \, \tilde{\Psi}(p) \, \tilde{\Upsilon}(q) \, e^{ik_\mu \hat{x}^\mu} e^{ip_\nu \hat{x}^\nu} e^{iq_\rho \hat{x}^\rho}\\
&= \int d^4\hat{x} \int d^4k \int d^4p \int d^4q \, \tilde{\Phi}(k) \ \tilde{\Psi}(p) \ \tilde{\Upsilon}(q) e^{i(k \oplus p \oplus q)_\mu \hat{x}^\mu}\\
&= (2\pi)^4 \int d^4k \int d^4p \int d^4q \ \tilde{\Phi}(k) \ \tilde{\Psi}(p) \ \tilde{\Upsilon}(q) \, \delta^{(4)}(k \oplus p \oplus q)
\end{aligned}$$

where $\oplus$ is such that

$$(k \oplus p)_0 = k_0 + p_0 \tag{4}$$

$$(k \oplus p)_2 = k_2 + p_2 \tag{5}$$

$$(k \oplus p)_1 = \frac{k_2 + p_2}{1 - e^{\ell(k_2+p_2)}} \left[\frac{1 - e^{\ell k_2}}{k_2 e^{\ell p_2}} k_1 + \frac{1 - e^{\ell p_2}}{p_2} p_1 \right] \tag{6}$$

This result is rooted in one of the most studied aspects of such noncommutative spacetimes, which is their "generalized star product" [1–3]. This is essentially a characterization of the properties of products of exponentials induced by rules of noncommutativity of type (1). Specifically, one easily arrives at (3) (with $\oplus$ such that, in particular, (6) holds) by just observing that from the defining commutator (1) it follows that[1] [2, 3]

$$\begin{aligned}
&\log\left[\exp\left(ik_2\hat{x}_2 + ik_1\hat{x}_1\right) \exp\left(ip_2\hat{x}_2 + ip_1\hat{x}_1\right)\right] = \qquad (7)\\
&= i\hat{x}_2(p_2 + k_2) + i\hat{x}_1 \frac{k_2 + p_2}{1 - e^{\ell(k_2+p_2)}} \left(\frac{1 - e^{\ell k_2}}{k_2 e^{\ell p_2}} k_1 + \frac{1 - e^{\ell p_2}}{p_2} p_1 \right)
\end{aligned}$$

The so-called soccer-ball problem concerns the acceptability of laws of composition of type (6). Since one assumes that the deformation scale ℓ is of the order

[1] Eq. (7) is a particular example of application of the Baker-Campbell-Hausdorff formula for products of exponentials of noncommuting variables. In general the Baker-Campbell-Hausdorff formula involves an infinite series of nested commutators, but the case of noncommutativity (1) is one of the cases for which the series of nested commutators can be resummed explicitly [2, 3].

of the inverse of the Planck scale, applying (6) to microscopic/fundamental particles has no sizable consequences: of course (6) gives us back to good approximation $(k \oplus p)_1 \simeq k_1 + p_1$ whenever $|\ell k_2| \ll 1$ and $|\ell p_2| \ll 1$. But if a law of composition such as (6) should be used also when we add very many microparticle momenta in obtaining the total momentum of a multiparticle system (such as a soccer ball) then the final result could be pathological [14–25] even when each microparticle in the system has momentum much smaller than $1/\ell$.

III. SUM OF MOMENTA FROM TRANSLATIONAL INVARIANCE

As clarified in the brief review of known results given in the previous section, a nonlinear law of composition of momenta arises in characterizations of locality, as a direct consequence of the form of some star products. My main point here is that a different law of composition of momenta is produced by the analysis of translational invariance, and it is this other law of composition of momenta which is relevant for the characterization of the total momentum of a multi-particle system. Here too I shall just use known facts about the peculiarities of translation transformations in certain noncommutative spacetimes, but exploit them for obtaining results that had not been derived before, indeed results relevant for the description of the total momentum of a multi-particle system.

A first hint that translation transformations should be modified [4–6] in certain noncommutative spacetimes comes from noticing that (1) is incompatible with the standard Heisenberg relations $[p_j, x_k] = i\delta_{jk}$. Indeed, if one adopts (1) and $[p_j, x_k] = i\delta_{jk}$ one then easily finds that some Jacobi identities are not satisfied. The relevant Jacobi identities are satisfied if one allows for a modification of the Heisenberg relations which balances for the noncommutativity of the coordinates:

$$[p_1, x_1] = i \ , \quad [p_1, x_2] = 0 \ , \quad [p_2, x_2] = i \ , \tag{8}$$

$$[p_1, x_2] = -i\ell p_1 \ , \tag{9}$$

One easily finds that combining (1), (8) and (9) all Jacobi identities are satisfied [4–6].

Additional intuition for these nonstandard properties of the momenta p_j comes from actually looking at which formulation of translation transformations preserves the form of the noncommutativity of coordinates (1). Evidently the standard description

$$x_2 \to x_2' = x_2 + a_2 \ , \quad x_1 \to x_1' = x_1 + a_1$$

is not a symmetry of (1):

$$[x_1', x_2'] = [x_1 + a_1, x_2 + a_2] = i\ell x_1 = i\ell(x_1' - a_1) \tag{10}$$

Unsurprisingly what does work is the description of translation transformations using as generators the p_j of (8)-(9), which as stressed above satisfy the Jacobi-identity criterion. These deformed translation transformations take the form

$$\begin{aligned} x_1' &= x_1 - ia_1[p_1, x_1] - ia_2[p_2, x_1] = x_1 + a_1 \ , \\ x_2' &= x_2 - ia_1[p_1, x_2] - ia_2[p_2, x_2] = x_2 + a_2 - \ell a_1 p_1 \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

and indeed are symmetries of the commutation rules (1):

$$\begin{aligned} [x_1', x_2'] &= [x_1 + a_1, x_2 + a_2 - \ell a_1 p_1] = \\ &= i\ell x_1 - \ell a_1 [x_1, p_1] = i\ell(x_1 + a_1) = i\ell x_1' \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

All this about translation transformations in certain noncommutative spacetimes is well known (see, *e.g.*, Refs. [4–6]). The part which I am here going to contribute is to show how this is relevant for the mentioned much-debated issue about the total momentum of a multi-particle system. My starting point is that in order for us to be able to even contemplate the total momentum of a multiparticle system we must be dealing with a case where translational invariance is ensured: total momentum is the conserved charge for a translationally invariant multi-particle system. Surely the introduction of translationally invariant multi-particle systems must involve some subtleties due to the noncommutativity of coordinates, and these subtleties are directly connected to the new properties of translation transformations (9), but they are not directly connected to the properties of the star product (7) and the associated law of composition of momenta (6). For my purposes, also considering the heated debate that precedes this contribution of mine, it is best to show the implications of this point very simply and explicitly, focusing on a system of two particles interacting via an harmonic potential.

I start by noticing that evidently one does not achieve translational invariance through a description of the form

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_{non-transl} =& \frac{(p_1^A)^2}{2m} + \frac{(p_2^A)^2}{2m} + \frac{(p_1^B)^2}{2m} + \frac{(p_2^B)^2}{2m} + \\ &+ \frac{1}{2}\rho[(x_1^A - x_1^B)^2 + (x_2^A - x_2^B)^2] \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

where indices A and B label the two particles involved in the interaction via the harmonic potential. As stressed above translation transformations consistent with the coordinate noncommutativity (1) must be such that (see (11)) $x_1 \to x_1 + a_1$ and $x_2 \to x_2 + a_2 - \ell a_1 p_1$, and as a result by writing the harmonic potential with $(x_1^A - x_1^B)^2 + (x_2^A - x_2^B)^2$ one does not achieve translational invariance.

One does get translational invariance by adopting instead

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H} =& \frac{(p_1^A)^2}{2m} + \frac{(p_2^A)^2}{2m} + \frac{(p_1^B)^2}{2m} + \frac{(p_2^B)^2}{2m} + \\ &+ \frac{1}{2}\rho[(x_1^A - x_1^B)^2 + (x_2^A + \ell x_1^A p_1^A - x_2^B - \ell x_1^B p_1^B)^2] \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

This is trivially invariant under translations generated by p_2, which simply produce $x_1 \to x_1$ and $x_2 \to x_2 + a_2$. And it is also invariant under translations generated by

p_1, since they produce $x_1 \to x_1 + a_1$ and $x_2 \to x_2 - \ell a_1 p_1$, so that $x_2 + \ell x_1 p_1$ is left unchanged:

$$x_2 + \ell x_1 p_1 \to x_2 - \ell a_1 p_1 + \ell(x_1 + a_1) p_1 = x_2 + \ell x_1 p_1$$

It is interesting for my purposes to see which conserved charge is associated with this invariance under translations of the hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}$. This conserved charge will describe the total momentum of the two-particle system governed by $\mathcal{H}$, *i.e.* the center-of-mass momentum. It is easy to see that this conserved charge is just the standard $\vec{p}^A + \vec{p}^B$. For the second component one trivially finds that indeed

$$[p_2^A + p_2^B, \mathcal{H}] = 0$$

and the same result also applies to the first component:

$$\begin{aligned}[p_1^A + p_1^B, \mathcal{H}] \propto\ & [p_1^A + p_1^B, (x_1^A - x_1^B)^2] + \\ & + [p_1^A + p_1^B, (x_2^A + \ell x_1^A p_1^A - x_2^B - \ell x_1^B p_1^B)^2] = \\ & = [p_1^A + p_1^B, (x_2^A + \ell x_1^A p_1^A - x_2^B - \ell x_1^B p_1^B)^2] \propto \\ & \propto [p_1^A + p_1^B, x_2^A + \ell x_1^A p_1^A - x_2^B - \ell x_1^B p_1^B] \\ & = -i\ell p_1^A + i\ell p_1^A + i\ell p_1^B - i\ell p_1^B = 0 \end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

where the only non-trivial observation I have used is that (1) leads to $[p_1, x_2 + \ell x_1 p_1] = -i\ell p_1 + i\ell p_1 = 0$.

The result (15) shows that indeed $\vec{p}^A + \vec{p}^B$ is the momentum of the center of mass of my translationally-invariant two-particle system, *i.e.* it is the total momentum of the system.

The concerns about total momentum that had been voiced in discussions of the Planck-scale soccer-ball problem were rooted in the different sum of momenta relevant for locality, the $\oplus$ sum discussed in the previous section. It was feared that one should obtain the total momentum by combining single-particle momenta with the nonlinear $\oplus$ sum. The result (15) shows that this expectation was incorrect. One can also directly verify that indeed $\vec{p}^A \oplus \vec{p}^B$ is not a conserved charge for my translationally-invariant two-particle system, and specifically, taking into account (6), one finds that

$$[(\vec{p}^A \oplus \vec{p}^B)_1, \mathcal{H}] \neq 0$$

IV. IMPLICATIONS AND OUTLOOK

At least within the framework of spacetime noncommutativity I have shown that there is no "soccer-ball problem", and I am confident that analogous results will emerge in other formalisms with nonlinearities in momentum space. This should mature gradually as the understanding of other formalisms matures to the point of appreciating the differences between the law of composition of momenta obtained by enforcing some form of locality and the law of addition of momenta used for building up the total momentum of a multi-particle system.

As usual in physics, attempts to generalize a theory also help us understand the theory itself: the analysis I here reported makes us appreciate how our current theories are built on a non-trivial correspondence between the momentum-space manifestations of locality and translational invariance. This can be viewed from a different perspective by reconsidering the fact that in Galilean relativity all laws of composition of momenta and velocities are linear, and there is a linear relationship between velocity and momentum. Within Galilean-relativistic theories one could choose to never speak of momentum, and work exclusively in terms of velocities, with apparently a single linear law of composition of velocities. In our current post-Galilean theories, the relationship between momentum and velocity is non-linear and we then manage to appreciate differences between composition laws (in our current theories all laws of composition of momenta remain linear, but velocities are composed non-linearly).

I should devote one final remark to the fact that aspects of my analysis pertaining to translational invariance were confined to a first-quantized system. This came out of necessity since several grey areas remain for the formulation of second quantization with κ-Minkowski noncomutativity. As a matter of fact I here provided the first ever translationally-invariant formulation of an interacting theory in κ-Minkowski. All previous attempts had been made within quantum field theory, and led to unsatisfactory results, particularly for what concerns global translational invariance. Perhaps the results I here reported could provide guidance for improving on previous attempts at formulating interacting quantum field theories in κ-Minkowski. In particular, it might be appropriate to make room for some novel notion of "coincidence of points", a possibility which had not been considered in previous attempts. I see a hint pointing in this direction in the structure of my translationally-invariant harmonic potential: unlike standard Harmonic potentials, the potential in my Eq. (14) does not vanish when the coordinates of the particles coincide: the potential in Eq. (14) vanishes for $x_1^A = x_1^B$ and $x_2^A = x_2^B$, only if also the momenta coincide ($p_1^A = p_1^B$). This is reminiscent of some results obtained within the recently-proposed relative-locality framework [12], where the only meaningful notion of "coincidence" is a phase-space notion (not a notion that could be formulated exclusively in spacetime). This suggests that one could perhaps improve upon previous attempts of formulation of interacting quantum field theories in κ-Minkowski, by exploiting quantum-field-theory results being developed [26] for the relative-locality framework.

This work was supported in part by a grant from the John Templeton Foundation.

[1] S. Majid, hep-th/0006166, Lect.Notes Phys. 541 (2000) 227.

[2] P. Kosinski, J. Lukierski and P. Maslanka, hep-th/0009120, Czech.J.Phys. 50 (2000) 1283-1290

[3] A. Agostini, F. Lizzi and A. Zampini, hep-th/0209174, Mod.Phys.Lett. A17 (2002) 2105

[4] J. Lukierski, H. Ruegg and W.J. Zakrzewski, hep-th/9312153, Ann. Phys. 243 (1995) 90.

[5] G. Amelino-Camelia, J. Lukierski and A. Nowicki, gr-qc/9903066, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A14 (1999) 4575

[6] J. Kowalski-Glikman and S. Nowak, hep-th/0203040, Phys.Lett. B539 (2002) 126.

[7] C. Rovelli, Living Rev. Rel. 11 (2008) 5.

[8] L. Smolin, hep-th/0209079; G. Amelino-Camelia, L. Smolin and A. Starodubtsev, hep-th/0306134, Class. Quant. Grav. 21 (2004) 3095.

[9] K. Noui, gr-qc/0612144, J. Math. Phys. 47 (2006) 102501

[10] L. Freidel and E. R. Livine, Phys. Rev. Lett. 96 (2006) 221301 [hep-th/0512113].

[11] D. Oriti and J. Ryan, gr-qc/0602010, Class. Quant. Grav. 23 (2006) 6543.

[12] G. Amelino-Camelia, L. Freidel, J. Kowalski-Glikman and L. Smolin, Phys. Rev. D84 (2011) 084010.

[13] G. Amelino-Camelia, arXiv:0806.0339, Living Rev. Rel. 16 (2013) 5.

[14] J. Lukierski, hep-th/0112252, in "Proceedings of QTS2" (World Scientific)

[15] M. Maggiore, hep-th/0205014, Nucl. Phys. B647 (2002) 69.

[16] G. Amelino-Camelia, gr-qc/0210063, Int. J. Mod. Phys. D11 (2002) 1643.

[17] J. Kowalski-Glikman, hep-th/0405273, Lect. Notes Phys. 669 (2005) 131

[18] F. Girelli and E.R. Livine, gr-qc/0412079, Braz. J. Phys. 35 (2005) 432.

[19] T. Jacobson, S. Liberati and D. Mattingly, astro-ph/0505267, Annals Phys. 321 (2006) 150.

[20] S. Hossenfelder, hep-th/0702016, Phys. Rev. D75 (2007) 105005

[21] S. Mignemi, arXiv:0808.1628 Phys. Lett. B672 (2009) 186

[22] J.A. Magpantay, Phys. Rev. D84 (2011) 024016.

[23] G. Amelino-Camelia, L. Freidel, J. Kowalski-Glikman and L. Smolin, arXiv:1104.2019, Phys. Rev. D 84 (2011) 087702.

[24] S. Hossenfelder, arXiv:1202.4066, Phys.Rev. D88 (2013) 028701

[25] G. Amelino-Camelia, L. Freidel, J. Kowalski-Glikman and L. Smolin, arXiv:1307.0246, Phys.Rev. D88 (2013) 028702

[26] L. Freidel and T. Rempel, arXiv:1312.3674.